

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                           | FILING DATE    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/840,065                                | 05/06/2004     | Frank Ridel JR.      | 4429                    | 6653             |
| 75  | 590 06/12/2006 |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |
| R.C. Harpman                              |                |                      | STASHICK, ANTHONY D     |                  |
| Harpman & Harpman<br>819 Southwestern Run |                |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
| Youngstown, OH 44514                      |                |                      | 3728                    |                  |
|   |                |                      | DATE MAILED: 06/12/2006 |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



| Office Action Summary   | 10/840,065  Examiner  Anthony Stashick   | RIDEL, FRANK  Art Unit  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
|   |  | Art Unit  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Anthony Stashick   |   |  |  |  |  |
|   |  | 3728  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communicati n appearage.  Period for Reply   | ars on the cover sheet with the c  | orrespondence address   |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAT  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136( after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, can yreply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date armed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).   | TE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  (a). In no event, however, may a reply be time  apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ause the application to become ABANDONEI | l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |  |
| Status  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| , ,   | ction is non-final.  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the application.  | 4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or   | election requirement.  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>06 May 2004</u> is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul> |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 05062004.   | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:  |   |  |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 10/840,065 Page 2

Art Unit: 3728

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-2 and 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vassar 3,124,887 in view of Cohen 4,187,621. Vassar '887 discloses the limitations substantially as claimed including the following: an insole 4 for shoes for height re-orientation; the removable insert 4 having a tapered foot engagement upper surface 5, oppositely disposed depending sidewall surfaces (see Figures 2 and 3) and an arcuate back heel surface (see Figures 2 and 3); a flat bottom portion 7 and a tapered bottom heel portion (located under 6 in Figure 3); the side surfaces defining an area of maximum transverse dimension therebetween in spaced relation to the arcuate heel surface (see Figure 2); the side surface contoured laterally with a tapered foot portion and correspondingly tapered rear portion (see Figure 2); the tapered upper foot engagement surface and the tapered bottom heel portion are in parallel spaced relation to one another (see Figure 3, the top surface and tapered bottom surface just under 6 are parallel); the area of maximum transverse dimension defines an upper foot engagement surface front portion of a known upper surface area less than that of a remaining upper surface area (see Figure 2); the insert is of a dimension for insertion into a shoe (see Figure 1); the tapered foot engagement surface provides an angular increasing surface height from the front to the back terminating at the arcuate back heel surface (See Figures 1-3); the transition from the bottom flat surface to the tapered bottom heel portion is longitudinally inward of the arcuate back heel surface junction therewith and with the junction of the tapered foot engagement upper surface (see Figure 2, tapers in arch area). Vassar '887 does not specifically disclose the material makeup of the insert. Cohen '621 teaches that an insert used inside a

Application/Control Number: 10/840,065 Page 3

Art Unit: 3728

shoe to support a user's foot can be made of a closed cell cross-linked polyethylene allowing it to be tough and abrasion resistant yet flexible. Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to make the insert of Vassar '887 out of closed cell cross-linked polyethylene, as taught by Cohen '621, to make it more tough, abrasion resistant and still allow for flexibility of the insert.

3. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 1 above in view of Hills Des. 25,242. The references as applied to claim 1 above disclose all the limitations of the claim except the insert being a monolithic mass and sculptured into the shaped configuration. Hills '242 shows that an insert for insertion into a heel of a shoe can be a monolithic mass (i.e. made of one piece of one material). Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to make the insert of the references as applied to claim 1 above out of a single piece of a single material, as shown by Hills '242, to make it more sturdy and avoid any separation of layers that might occur due to temperature and humidity. With respect to the insert being sculpted, it appears that this would make the claim a product-by-process claim and since a product is claimed and a similar product is found, it is not necessary to find it made by the same process, i.e. sculpted and shaped.

## Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure and are cited on form 892 enclosed herewith.

Applicant is duly reminded that a complete response must satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F. R.

1.111, including: "The reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references. A general allegation that the claims "define a patentable invention" without specifically pointing out how

Art Unit: 3728

the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section. Moreover, "The prompt development of a clear Issue requires that the replies of the applicant meet the objections to and rejections of the claims." Applicant should also specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP 2163.06 II(A), MPEP 2163.06 and MPEP 714.02. The "disclosure" includes the claims, the specification and the drawings.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Stashick whose telephone number is 571-272-4561. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:30 am until 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mickey Yu can be reached on 571-272-4562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Anthony Stashick Primary Examiner Art Unit 3728